



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

The Next Step in Democracy. By R. W. SELLARS. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1916.—pp. 275.

Socialism may be regarded either as an economic theory pure and simple or as a large movement of life. As the former, it is a tolerably well-defined description of the economic stages through which society passes. The emphasis is upon what, in economic fact, has been and is and inevitably is to be. There is no emphasis upon what ought to be. To many of us, such socialism has become increasingly unsatisfactory. It smacks too much of older dogmatic certitudes; it builds itself too perilously out of abstract economic absolutes; it is altogether too little conscious of the pregnant confusions and the creative uncertainties of life; above all, it makes no confident call upon the moral enthusiasms of men. It is for these reasons, doubtless, that to many of us, sympathetic as we have been with the fundamental insight of Marx, socialism has of necessity come to mean something very different from a mere description of the fated march of Economic Fact. It has come to mean a large movement of life, more particularly a movement of moral revolt against the regnant complacencies. It has come to mean an indignant rebuke, on the one hand, to the middle class treatment of the 'under dog,' and, on the other hand, to the middle class's treatment of itself. It has come to mean in short a plea for a finer justice, a more compassionate humanity, a plea likewise for a more intelligent marshalling of our human resources and for a more drastic elimination of the social crudities and stupidities.

The prevalent confusion as to what, precisely, socialism signifies arises out of this duality of meaning that has grown up within the socialist camp itself. As a matter of fact, socialism, particularly in America, is entering upon a new period of its history. America was never over-cordial to the socialism 'made in Germany.' There was too much that was autocratic about the Marxian doctrine; too much that reminded us of the relentlessness of a cosmic drill-master. If, indeed, we accepted Marxianism for the time being, it was for want of something better. The doctrine was, in a way, a vent for our outraged feelings; it gave fighting edge to our swords. Yet we never felt quite comfortable with it; it wasn't fashioned after the pattern of ourselves. Of late, America has been developing a native type of social self-consciousness. Through the stress of our more recent problems, we have been growing steadily into a consciousness of the cruel ineptitude of our middle class judgments; and we have been turning in this direction and in that for light out of our darkness, with the result that a new movement of life is beginning among us, a movement that is economic, political, and social; a movement of revolt that is at the same time a movement of constructive purpose; a movement experi-

mental, pragmatic; above all, a movement instinct with the moral enthusiasm that is fundamental in America at its best.

It is this large, forward-looking movement of modern life that Dr. Sellars describes in his book. The book apparently is a treatise on socialism; but it is on socialism of this broader kind. "Socialism is the democratic movement whose purpose it is to secure an *economic organization* which will give the maximum possible at any time of justice and liberty." That definition will fit any serious minded American progressive. Indeed the criticism that will be made upon Dr. Sellars's book by the dyed-in-the-wool Marxian will be that it isn't a book on socialism at all but only a more or less sugar-coated account of bourgeois progressivism. And there is some justification of this criticism from the Marxian point of view, for the reason that Dr. Sellars's handling of the great central theme of socialistic theory—capitalism—is exceedingly gingerly. Indeed the word does not even appear in the index. Nor is there any clear-cut discussion of such problems as banking, investment, interest, etc. By reason of this the chapter on Some Principles of Pecuniary Reward is vague and unsatisfactory.

We should indeed have welcomed a more penetrating approach to these central economic matters on the part of the author; and yet we must not fail to be grateful for the kind of thing that he has done. He has, as a matter of fact, pioneered in the above mentioned new development of American socialism. He has broadened socialism's foundations. He has linked it up with our modern ethical enthusiasms. He has exorcised its old Hegelian spirit of absolutism and brought to it the fresher American spirit of trial and error. Above all he has made it not the antagonist but the ally—the somewhat more far-seeing ally—of American progressivism. This is sufficiently clear from the author's enumeration of what socialism is and what it is not. Socialism (1) is not the same as anarchism; (2) is not identifiable with syndicalism as such, though it welcomes certain tendencies contained in syndicalism; (3) is not bureaucratic; (4) is not communism. Socialism, in its constructive purpose, hopes (1) to reduce the disorder characteristic of the market as at present organized; (2) to lessen the waste characteristic of present methods; (3) to eliminate all degrees of competition that are obviously antisocial in their consequences; (4) to eliminate unmerited poverty; (5) to tap new energies which are now latent and are not elicited by our social arrangements; (6) to make labor-saving devices really saving of labor; (7) to procure a fair degree of leisure for each individual; (8) to achieve a better distribution of human costs; (9) to bring in its wake a society, healthier physically and morally, and one ever more capable of developing sane and progressive institutions.

All these are the hopes of forward looking Americans. The latter may, indeed, make wry faces at having their hopes classed as socialistic; but when they read Dr. Sellars's book and note his fine freedom from most of the mordant elements of the older socialism, they may be less disturbed in spirit. As one reads the book, indeed, one wonders whether socialism is not dying to its doctrinal separateness and living more broadly and richly into the democratic life of the day.

One thing assuredly Dr. Sellars has done for us. He has broken into the sedate circle of philosophy with this *enfant terrible* of our modern thought. He has, we must confess, dressed the child a little over sweetly and trained it to too melting a tone. But that matters little. The terrible child is in. May it now energize within the shocked circle of the elders!

H. A. OVERSTREET.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

Artists and Thinkers. By LOUIS WILLIAM FLACCUS. New York, Longmans Green, and Company, 1916.—pp. 200.

It is Pascal, as I recall, who defines metaphysics as "une poésie sophistiquée"; a countryman of Pascal, G. Bréton, writing on the Greek philosophical poets, says "la métaphysique est l'âme de toute poésie." In these contrasting characterizations we have set for us, not only a relation of the two forms of expression, but the problem of the nature of their community.

It is this problem which Professor Flaccus makes the text, as it were, of his group of essays entitled *Artists and Thinkers*. "A philosopher must have his problem," he says, "—a trade weakness . . . but one in which I must confess a share." And he proceeds to state his problem in giving the program of his book: "I have taken my material from the borderland of art and philosophy. I have chosen three artists—Rodin, Wagner, Maeterlinck—who have achieved greatness in such widely different arts as sculpture, music, and the drama; and three thinkers—Tolstoy, Hegel, and Nietzsche—who are quite unlike and fairly representative. All these men had much to say on art; they have discussed special points and formulated general theories. Many of these theories are fanciful, unsound, clumsy; these I have given as well as others which show remarkable insight. Incidentally I may have touched on the truth of a theory or weighed it historically, but the main interest has been elsewhere: in the problem of the interplay of art and philosophy; in tracing the Thinker in the Artist and the Artist in the Thinker."

Regretfully it must be stated that the expectations raised by Professor Flaccus's 'main interest' are disappointed in the sequel. The problem of tracing "the thinker in the artist and the artist in the thinker" is certainly a fascinating one, and should be rich in substance if carried through with that combination of judicious reserve and lively sympathy which marks your biographer of genius. For the problem is essentially a biographical one; it implies an intimate study of the human individual who may happen to be an artist or a thinker, with a view to showing his art or his thought as the necessary and central expression of his personality,—such a study, for example, as Plato gives us of the man Socrates. Professor Flaccus nowhere approaches his subjects from such a point of view; rather he gives us, in each case, a circumferential survey of the ideas (on the theme of art) with which his exemplars have publicly surrounded themselves,—so that his essays convey the general impression of studied interviews, too careful to be counted mere journalism, yet never penetrating to the artist behind the art or the thinker behind the thought.